

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PETER TILTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE MCGRAW-HILL COMPANIES, INC.,  
*et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C06-0098RSL

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART MOTION  
TO FILE OVERLENGTH REPLY

This matter comes before the Court on defendants' motion to file an overlength reply in support of their motion to dismiss. (Dkt. #60). Although Local Rule 7(f) requires that a motion to file an overlength memorandum must be filed at least three judicial days before the underlying memorandum is due, defendants filed their motion on the same day their reply was due. Ordinarily, the Court would deny the motion under these circumstances. In this case, however, defendants have shown good cause to file an overlength memorandum.

Defendants have requested to file a 30-page reply memorandum. They have not shown a need to file such a lengthy reply, especially in light of the fact that plaintiff's opposition complied with the 24-page limit. Accordingly, defendants' motion to file an overlength reply memorandum is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. Defendants must refile their reply memorandum no later than December 8, 2006; the memorandum shall be limited to 20

1 pages. Defendants need not refile the documents filed in support of their reply or deliver a  
2 revised chambers' copy.

3  
4 DATED this 6th day of December, 2006.

5  
6 

7 Robert S. Lasnik  
8 United States District Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27